

May 8, 1987

LB 767

net effect is an increase from the present \$1 to \$1.75 as the bill stands at this point. Senator Coordsen's amendment was adopted, as you will remember. That was the amendment which puts this money in the General Fund rather than into a fund that the Motor Vehicles Department has control over. So I think that is a clean method of handling it so that the funds required by that department are then appropriated by this body, through the Appropriations Committee, and we will have a handle on those costs. So at this point the bill is ready to be advanced, in my opinion, and I would urge the advancement of the bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, sir. Discussion on the motion to advance LB 767? Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I have a motion that is being placed on the desk, Mr. Chairman.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to indefinitely postpone 767.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, this is a bill, as Senator Lamb indicated, that we talked about the other day. He didn't want to try to advance it on that day because he wasn't certain that he had enough votes, so somebody moved to adjourn us, and that is why we come back to the bill today. I don't know how many people are gone, so I would like to ask if I may. Oh, Senator Beyer said there are 41 here so I guess he wants me to subtract and conclude that 7 are gone, 7 or 8. Anyway, I have an idea that there are some gone. The reason I'm opposed to this bill is because it contains a tax. Senator Labedz mentioned the other day that she would call it a fee, but in reality it is a tax. You might call it a fee if it were needed to recoup the cost of providing the information that is being sought. But it is clear from the discussions we had the other day that far more is being raised from this \$1.75 fee than the cost of producing it. As a matter of fact, based on one figure cited, it is almost three times as much. It was, frankly, I think acknowledged that it is a revenue generator. I don't think that the state should try to raise revenue from providing information of this kind. I think it is an inappropriate taxing activity by the state. Yesterday 773 was passed, it was a tax increase. No matter how it is phrased this is a tax increase. So, with all of the pontificating by the Governor during her campaign, I don't see how she can sign 773,